

THE DUBIOUS AND SINISTER AGENDA

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

AN EXAMINATION OF THE REPORT
"NIGERIA: A HARROWING JOURNEY"
BY AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL



MOSES AYOMIKUN OLADIPUPO

THE DUBIOUS AND SINISTER AGENDA OF AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

By

[Moses Ayomikun Oladipupo](http://Moses.Ayomikun.Oladipupo)
(www.ayomikun.com.ng)

Scripture quotations are taken from the HOLY BIBLE, KING JAMES BIBLE

First Released in 2022

This book may be freely copied and redistributed provided it is not modified
in any way.

Publishing and graphic design by
[Crystal Frames](http://Crystal.Frames)
(www.crystalframes.com.ng)

Online Stores For Download
www.cf-stores.com

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
• How I Came Across The Report.....	4
• What Is Amnesty International?.....	5
2. AN INDICTMENT OF NIGERIA.....	7
3. A DEROGATION OF OUR CULTURE AND VALUES.....	8
4. PRESENTING A CASE FOR ABORTION LAWS.....	10
5. WAR AGAINST PATRIARCHY.....	12
6. POOR AND UNVERIFIABLE INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS.....	14
7. REALLY ABSURD STANCE ON RAPE.....	17
8. ABSURD STANCE ON SO CALLED MARITAL RAPE.....	26
9. HYPOCRISIES.....	29
10. SUNDRY ISSUES.....	38
• Laws And More Laws.....	38
• The Achievement Of Being Raped.....	40
• Unquantifiable Trauma.....	40
• Swimming Through Blood.....	42
• Gender Based Violence Are Usually Avertible.....	43
11. CONCLUSION.....	45
• A Little Story.....	45
• The Devil Behind The Movement.....	47
• The Disadvantage Of The Movement.....	48
• The Enemies Within.....	50
• Advice To The Nigerian Woman.....	52
• Summary.....	53
• Closing Remarks.....	54

INTRODUCTION

In my article titled, "**THE SIXTEEN DAYS OF ACTIVISM - MY REVIEW**", I made mention of a report by Amnesty International titled, "NIGERIA: A HARROWING JOURNEY", and I said there were a lot of disturbing things in it. In this book I'll like to examine this report and hope to present what it reveals about the agenda of Amnesty International.

This book originally started out as an article, a follow up article to "**THE SIXTEEN DAYS OF ACTIVISM - MY REVIEW**", but as I progressed it started becoming so long and while it was already too long to be an article, the conclusion still seemed far out of sight. I therefore thought it would be better to present it as a book rather than as an article.

How I Came Across The Report

I attended an event designed to create awareness against rape and gender based violence. After the main sections of the program, a lady came up and presented the report, "NIGERIA: A HARROWING JOURNEY", and talked about what it contains and what they're fighting against. She alleged that due to the COVID lockdown there were cases of rape and there were outcry throughout the country saying, "I'm sure a lot of you tweeted, made Facebook posts and things like that. There was outrage across the country. People were angry. People march across the country..." I don't really know which part of the country these outcry occurred. Had there been such cases, at least there should be some screenshots of the tweets and outcries. I heard of looting, I heard of many things, but nothing about an outcry about COVID-related rape cases. She said that this outcry was what triggered the research that birthed the report.

I read the report with the intention of actively taking a part in seeking justice. When I came for the event, people were asked to write their names and email if they'd like to volunteer for Amnesty International. I refused because I don't like making impulse decisions. I'd like to study a thing first, understand it thoroughly before taking a part in it. But not long into the program, I glanced at their website and also heard in the program the things that were said about their goals in seeking justice for vulnerable people, etc., I got up, went to the back and penned down my name and email willing to be a part of this movement. To be sure that I did have an interest in volunteering they can check the list of names and emails submitted to them and they'd see my

name and email. Unless they just made us waste our time writing them down. So this book was not born out of a pathological dislike for the movement and what it claims to strive for. Rather it was born of the realisation that there are evidences of dubiousness in the movement.

When the lady had finished speaking, I asked her for the report she had in her hand that I'd like to go through it. After glancing through it and learning that the soft copy was available on the net, I returned the report to her determining to get the soft copy and go through it with the intent of writing something on the matter and sharing it with my little audience. But on reading it I realised it is not in pursuit of justice of any kind. They're just pursuing some other agenda entirely. This is the essence of writing this book. To point out the dubiousness of the report and bring the sinisterness of it to light.

This book was not written to Amnesty International as much as it is to the public. Hence there things you may see that aren't a response to them or their report. There are some explanations I gave and views I shared, not because I think it is necessary for a response to the report, but to share my views with the public on things I consider rather important in how we see things.

What Is Amnesty International?

Amnesty International defines itself thus:

"Amnesty International is a movement of 10 million people which mobilises the humanity in everyone and campaigns for change so we can all enjoy our human rights. Our vision is of a world where those in power keep their promises, respect international law and are held to account."

"We are independent of any government, political ideology, economic interest or religion and are funded mainly by our membership and individual donations. We believe that acting in solidarity and compassion with people everywhere can change our societies for the better."

It is important to get their own opinion of themselves first before we examine them for who they truly are. A man's own testimony of himself is the most important when mere testimonies are considered. The testimonies of others are only of little account. However, moving from their testimony of themselves we must examine their words and actions and see if it truly tallies with their testimony. This will help us to see if their testimony is true or a deceptive description to mask a true motive.

Right from their own testimony we can see an ominous statement, "Our vision is of a world where those in power... respect international law and are held to account." Now, this statement betrays the following declaration which states, "We are independent of any government, political ideology, economic interest or religion..." It is obvious from the initial statement that Amnesty International is not independent but is merely an arm of the globalist adventurers who seek to use the compassionate face of Amnesty International to bend those in power under the sway of their "international laws".

What amazes me is what gives them the audacity to seek to hold leaders of sovereign nations accountable to laws not created by those they lead. How can mere individuals seek to hold those in power accountable if not backed by powerful power brokers? It is one thing to seek to empower citizens to hold their leaders accountable to the promises they made before their elections and according to the laws of the land. That would be wonderful for one of the fundamental tenets of democracy is that the people must hold the power to hold their leaders accountable. Had this been the vision of Amnesty International we would say that Amnesty International is fighting for the strengthening of democracies round the world. It is another thing entirely for Amnesty International to be seeking to hold leaders accountable to "INTERNATIONAL LAWS." Laws which citizens of nations know little about how or for what purpose those laws were formed. This is to weaken democracies and empower globalism. Having globalists working withing democracies spells a sinister omen.

So from their own testimony we can see that they have sinister motives that is not for the good of the nation. They are just pursuing the furtherance of a disaster bound globalisation. Let not the sentimental statement that they're so quick to introduce before anything else tamper with our reasoning faculty. The statement that goes, "Amnesty International is a movement... which mobilises the humanity in everyone..." and they also round it all up with another sentimental statement, "We believe that acting in solidarity and compassion with people everywhere..." Let not all these shew of sympathy hide from our eyes the true nature of their own declaration. As we also proceed through this book, let's not also allow the sentiments they're trying to stir lead us to fail to see things in their proper light.

We shall now proceed to examine this report

AN INDICTMENT OF NIGERIA

The gravest aspect of this report is that it is an indictment of the whole nation of Nigeria and her laws. You'd come across statements like, "Although Nigeria has an obligation to strengthen the collection of disaggregated statistical data on all forms of violence against women, available data is often sketchy and grossly inadequate to reflect the prevalence of rape." So this is not a report against individuals in the country, but against the country itself. This is pointing an accusing finger at our democracy.

The report says our laws are discriminatory against the female sex. It says Nigeria allows the rape of her daughters and denies access to justice. Wow! That is a really serious allegation to bring against our nation.

The boldness to indict a whole nation is quite a great one. And what should necessitate it is not a small issue. To indict a nation cannot be for minor issues but for great and gruesome atrocities being allowed to go on within her territories. I agree that the cases being put forward are gruesome. Whether they are true or not is another issue entirely. But it is an indictment of the whole nation all the same.

To indict a whole nation and her laws is not against those holding power but against the entire nation of Nigeria. The audacity to indict a whole nation is an effrontery by these so called "independent individuals" on our nationhood. Assuming there were real acts of gruesome atrocities going on, to support individuals under the provisions of our laws to fight such atrocities would have been a better approach, but to indict the nation of not having laws in place to address issues of such immense gravity or not having adequate laws, is a flagrant disregard of our nationhood.

If the things they say are true or founded on reason, then it would be near acceptable for them to indict a nation and her laws. And that should be done by moving the consciences of its citizens to make them act aright in bringing an end the atrocious monstrosity occurring within the territories of their nation. Not by trying to shove their leaders under the so called international law. But I appeal to you the reader to kindly follow me carefully as we examine this report.

A DEROGATION OF OUR CULTURE AND VALUES

Next thing about this report is that it contains a derogation of our values. In one instance it is written:

*"In Nigeria, the family name seems to be tied to the vag*na."*

What an insult to our values! It is true that we have strong values on chastity and sexual purity, to make such a derogatory statement of such values is very insulting. While we believe that our young (male and female) should be chaste and sexually pure, it does not warrant saying that it seems our family names are tied to the vag*na. That is a vulgar, godless and reproachful thing to say.

The report also states thus:

*"Harmful acts directed at an individual based on their gender.
It is rooted in gender inequality, the abuse of power and
harmful norms."*

The word "norm" and "culture" are synonymous. So when you say harmful norms you mean to say ours is an harmful culture. And what manner of people will institutionalise harmful things and hold them as a culture. Such a statement is a further insult on our persons, for in saying this they allege that the people of Nigeria are not right thinking people.

Towards the end of the report, there was a photo with people carrying a placard in which was written, "END RAPE CULTURE". This is what they call the culture of our fatherland. Everything in the report builds up and resonate this direct insult on the Nigerian people and their values.



The report is full of similar reproachful things, both of our values and laws. Though the people who were quoted are themselves Nigerians, we must not let it cloud our vision to understand that Amnesty International is not a Nigerian NGO. They only hire Nigerians to do their bidding. It has branches all over the world, it is merely an arm of globalist adventurers. Being an international body, even though they quoted the words of a Nigerian, to be admitting such derogatory statements into their report is outrightly shameless of them and completely unacceptable.

PRESENTING A CASE FOR ABORTION LAWS

The one thing I find most distasteful is that they try to make a case for abortion laws in Nigeria. This seems to me to be among the major motives behind this report. Reading through, it didn't seem that ending rape is even in their interest. Using rape as a case for abortion laws in Nigeria is what they sought to achieve. They wrote:

"Rape also puts women and girls at risk of unwanted pregnancy and unsafe abortions, due to Nigeria's restrictive abortion laws."

And this was kept up and constantly reiterated with words like,

"The CEDAW Committee has highlighted the high incidence of unsafe abortions due to Nigeria's restrictive abortion laws, which permit abortions only in order to save a pregnant woman's life. Due to the criminalisation of abortion in Nigeria, women and girls, as well as survivors of rape, often resort to unsafe abortions to terminate unwanted pregnancies. Restrictive laws foster unsafe abortions, which are sometimes carried out clandestinely by unskilled people in unsanitary settings, often leading to health complications and sometimes death for women and girls."

After saying this in the clearest terms, the rest of the article seemed like a random beating around the bush with words just to make up the pages. Sometimes they're talking about Nigerian Laws and legal procedures in ways that are just educative and not having any relevance to the matter being discussed at hand. It just seemed like they're saying, "we've made our point, but we can't just end the report like that. O yeah let's talk about this other stuff."

Nigeria is unanimously against abortion. To be using this dubious method to be trying to introduce abortion into our Laws is an attempt to subvert of the will of the people. Their mission becomes clearer yet again that they seek to impose their so called international laws on the Nigerian people against their wish. When they go after leaders to make them accountable to this foolish laws they call international laws, what else is their motive than tyranny? For when they get hold of the leaders they can bend the people.

They also made a statement I didn't quite understand that goes:

"Often, survivors are unable to access emergency contraception due to financial constraints, stigmatisation and lack of information on available options. Access to contraception information and services is fundamental to the health and rights of all individuals, including access to emergency contraception for survivors of rape. The Federal Ministry of Health has revealed that there is a low level of contraceptive prevalence in Nigeria, due to inadequate access to family planning services, poor quality of services, cultural factors, myths and misconceptions about contraception, gender inequity and inadequate demand creation efforts."

What exactly does contraceptive have to do with rape? I don't know much about these things but are they suggesting providing contraception to rape victims after the rape or what? My understanding of contraception is that it is preventive not corrective. It is used to avoid pregnancy with the predetermined intention to engage in a sexual activity which could result in pregnancy. Contraception after rape sounds strange. If I get it right, I suppose the argument here is early abortion which is no contraception but abortion. I stand to be corrected, but their bringing up the issues of contraception in rape cases sounds sinister, absurd and fishy.

Now, let's be clear on something, abortion has little or nothing to do with the welfare of rape victims. It is just a strife for moral depravity. Statistically, only one percent of abortions done are done by rape victims. Only one! So if abortion is legalised it is not rape victims who would use it as much as the promiscuous ones. So the fight to legalise abortion is not a fight for the well being of rape victims, but a fight for promiscuity and murder of the unborn.

To see people who claim to be fighting for the right of the oppressed in the society making a move to murder the voiceless unborn reveals another level of dubiousness in their strife. The fight for the oppressed in the society must be born of high morality and a lively conscience. But if in fighting for the mere rights (not the preservation of life) of the imaginary oppressed of the society, you take a firm stance and make a case for the need to legalise the killings of the unborn, which are not only weak and powerless but completely voiceless, where then is the conscience backing the movement to protect the oppressed? Where is the morals. If they had conscience and morals meant to be responsible for rising up in the defence of the weak and powerless, ought they not to be more forceful in the defence of the powerless and voiceless unborn? But the conscience and morals are nowhere to be found and it makes it absolutely clear that the pursuit to end rape and gender based violence is not born of a lively conscience at all, thus meaning it is nothing but a sham. A deception to cover up the wickedness of their true intentions.

WAR AGAINST PATRIARCHY

The report takes a firm stance against patriarchy. They wrote as follows:

"Violence against women has been recognised as a form of gender discrimination that results from the historically unequal power relations between women and men, and "seriously inhibits women's ability to enjoy rights and freedoms on a basis of equality with men."

"Such settlements of rape cases lead to further violations of women's rights and impunity for rape, because they are often hinged on patriarchal values, thereby having a negative impact on women's access to judicial review and remedies."

"The CEDAW Committee has urged States to "adopt and implement effective legislative and other appropriate preventive measures to address the underlying causes of gender-based violence against women, including patriarchal attitudes and stereotypes, inequality in the family and the neglect or denial of women's civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, as well as to promote women's empowerment, agency and voice."

"Over the years, Nigeria has experienced a sexual violence crisis that is deeply rooted in harmful patriarchal, social, cultural, traditional and religious norms, and that has now been heightened by the COVID-19 pandemic."

Now, what is patriarchy? Patriarchy is defined as a system of government in which the father is the head of the family and decent is traced through male line. In all our cultures fathers are the heads of the home according to dictates of wisdom. The idea that negates this, that is that a man should not be the head of his home, is completely foreign to Nigerian family system which further proves that Amnesty International is not a Nigerian NGO. To therefore say that our patriarchal values are the basis of rape and gender based violence is to reiterate the point that ours is a "rape culture". This is a further insult on our cultures and values.

The position of a husband and father is what is being degraded. Our cultures teaches us to honour our fathers and husbands, not to deride them and impute to them such shameful things. The same culture does not teach us to dishonour our mothers and wives but to hold them up in high honour and love and protect them. It does not teach us to rape them or abuse them. To say our culture which teaches mutual respect, protection, and care is a rape culture is insolent folly.

It is foolish to claim that the reason for violence against women is because the man is the head of his home and that she answers his name after marriage. There are also cases of women beating their husbands in this same culture. I can't remember ever hearing a man beating a woman in our neighbourhood but I of recent I've heard a woman beating her husband and the man had to start calling out for help. It was like two lions fighting, the banging against the iron gate, moving of furnitures, and all was so frightening. This of course is also extremely rare, but is the cause of this? Matriarchy? The claim that violence against women is rooted patriarchal norms or that these norms are harmful is evidently foolish.

Families can have misunderstanding which may result in a brawl which no culture promotes, supports, or condones. Brawling in the home is sad, but to say that it is because of patriarchy or matriarchy is a very foolish stance take.

POOR AND UNVERIFIABLE INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS

One thing I find quite dubious with this indictment about the report is that it is founded on hearsays. Apart from the one or two cases that were well reported and we know about, the rest were just hearsays. It is either those stories presented are completely fabricated, or they were not well investigated. I understand the need for anonymity for witnesses who testify on such things. It is expedient for their safety. But I also understand that this necessity is now being abused by many. It creates a scene where people can either cook up stories without anyone being able to verify them. It also gives perjured persons absolute freedom to give untrue accounts without fear of being held accountable for their untruths.

This is what we see in the report. There are testimony given with no valid names. So we can't even tell if those things mentioned are really true except we wish to take the words of the presenter for it. This is quite an unwise thing to do. We can't just assume that the report is trustworthy because they say it is true. There has to be things for us to examine as to be able to determine if something is true or not. And they didn't provide enough verifiable evidence for their report. All they did was to mention the relatively few cases we know and ramp up the numbers with these unverifiable testimonies. Forgive my use of the word "few". One case of rape is one too much. Therefore I only say it because is relatively few compared to their stats.

Reading the report of Miller and Martin against late Ravi Zacharias, I found this kind of exploitation of anonymity also. There were all manner of nameless and faceless people just saying all manner of things. It tarnished the man's image at the time, but his son, Nathan Zacharias, launched a campaign effectively proving that these testimonies are untrue. But are there any to be held accountable? I wrote an article on it titled, **"MY FURTHER TAKE ON THE CASE OF RAVI ZACHARIAS"**. In it I mentioned also many instances where people use mere testimonies to try to build up facts, presenting it as evidences. The unlearned public too get swayed with just anything without trying to study the validity of the things being presented. The same thing is playing out here. In this case it is not a man being indicted but a whole nation.

We could have assumed that these testimonies are true if only the composers of the report did show some level of honesty and soundness of mind. Had

they also showed evidences of their own efforts in verifying these testimonies we could have had some more reasons to believe them. Sadly they neither showed traits of honesty, neither did they show traits of soundness of mind. Rather the report has elements that hints that these are just framed up stories. Though they did say they conducted desk and field research but some of the things they reported are mere hearsay from another NGO. While some vague claims were made in an attempt to show the thoroughness of their study, they create more doubts rather than present proofs beyond already existing doubts.

In one instance they cited a UN report that there was a spike in the amount of gender based violence against women during the COVID lockdown. The UN report cited another agency presenting the reports. So the chain of hearsay is endless. This makes it very incredible. When I visited the agency's website to see what it contained, I couldn't even set my eyes on anything tangible to see if there methods were valid, how they get their statistics and all. So the UN takes this unverifiable statistics, publish a report on it, then Amnesty International picks it and presents it expecting us to accept it merely because the UN published it. This is really a shambolic and dishonest investigative process.

Kindly read one of the testimonies of a so called rape victim:

"Our landlord too was touching me in places that were not right. I was eight years old then and on one occasion, my dad saw him and then instead of my dad to caution him, he started beating me. He flogged me and gave me bruises all over my body. That was what contributed to my being quiet. So, I kept quiet, then it continued like that..."

Please help me to understand this story. A landlord was touching her in places that were not right, and when her father saw her he flogged her, and then she continued like that. Her dad saw him touching her ON ONE OCCASION, meaning the touching had been going on without her father seeing it. So where was this place (or places) that the touching was happening that her father wasn't aware of? Something doesn't just sound right with that.

Well, I don't know which planet this event happened. But a man on this planet, except he were a cultist, or in debt to the landlord, could not possibly act the way described. It is well known that men are particularly over protective and sensitive about their daughters. I'm not a father yet, but I have nieces, and I know how closely I monitor them when they're around me. I heard a story of a man with a daughter who got himself a gun and put a banner at their house written, "KEEP OFF. If you can read this know you're

within range." He didn't want anyone coming near his daughter. That's just a story, but I've first-handedly seen that men are very sensitive and protective of their daughters. I speak of men on this planet. A man couldn't possibly see his landlord molesting his daughter and wouldn't let all hell lose on that landlord. If he were such a base person who is owing his rent and thus wouldn't wish to caution his landlord, he wouldn't beat the girl. And beating the girl, what did he beat her for? He beat her for her to continue like that? To continue making herself available to be touched in places that were not right so as to avoid being beaten? The whole story is just absurd. And seeing such an absurd story is admitted into the report, it cast a cloud of doubt on all the others of which they also have their own absurdities.

As said, I actually came to study this report to see the evils done against women to see if there's a way I could contribute to end it, probably by writing on the issue and sharing it with my little audience, but as I progressed I realised it contained endless absurdities and was meant for an evil purpose.

Lastly, they presented many criminal deeds, but which one of them were brought to book? Many rape cases, but not one death sentence. At least when we start getting to see people serving their sentences we could know that they were true. So there is a thick cloud of doubt on this report.

REALLY ABSURD STANCE ON RAPE

Moving further in the report I came across some really absurd arguments about rape that would make one think if these people even have any idea of what they're talking about.

First their definition of rape is so diametrically opposed to sound reason. Listen to this:

"Often, victims of rape do not physically resist: There should be no assumption, in law or in practice, that a person gives consent because they have not physically resisted. Just because a woman doesn't have visible injuries, didn't say NO or did not show resistance, doesn't mean she was not raped."

It starts with a blatant lie, "Often, victims of rape do not physically resist..." If victims of rape often don't physically resist, then how do they resist? Spiritually? Or maybe psychologically? Or yet diabolically? When they say physically resist it means all forms of resistance for something that requires physical force to be carried out can only be resisted physically. Then how can a person who knows that she's about to be violated and the consequences and traumatising effect this would bring not resist? And they use the word "often" meaning in most cases. Absolutely weird and silly.

Then comes the next point, "There should be no assumption, in law or in practice, that a person gives consent because they have not physically resisted." Wow! Then what exactly is rape? Rape is having sexual intercourse with someone by force. If it is not by force then it is not rape. If the person has been prevailed upon psychologically or by offers of one benefit or the other then that can be called seduction, not rape. So they clearly have little or no idea about what they're fighting so hard for. Or what they claim to be fighting for.

It continues, "Just because a woman doesn't have visible injuries, didn't say NO or did not show resistance, doesn't mean she was not raped." So, if rape is to be investigated, then how do you gather evidences? If the fact that they did not resist, did not say no, and did not have any physical injuries can't be gathered as evidence, then what can be used as evidence? Nothing.

They clearly state that silence itself in the case of rape is not consent. They wrote,

"Consent is:

Given freely: Sexual consent must be a voluntary and free choice for all parties involved. Being silent or not saying no is not the same as giving consent. Unconscious people and people incapacitated by alcohol or drugs cannot consent. Sex is not consensual when under coercion or intimidation. There might be other situations in which a person is not capable of genuinely consenting – for example, if they don't have the mental capacity to consent or are underage.

Informed: Lying or deliberately hiding certain intentions, such as unprotected sex, is not consensual sex. Forcing someone who is too drunk to refuse sex to agree to certain practices is not getting consent.

Specific: Consenting to one thing (e.g., kissing) does not mean consenting to everything else.

Reversible: Consenting once does not mean consenting forever. Even within an ongoing sexual act, one should be free to pause or stop at any time and to revoke consent.

Enthusiastic: The question is not whether a person says "no", but whether they say "yes" or otherwise actively express consent in a variety of verbal and non-verbal ways."

In the first point that consent is freely given and that people may not be able to give their consent when drunk, under coercion, etc. is true, but it does not mean that silence is not consent. When someone is drunk or being coerced, etc., if a person is silent or even if he or she expresses consent verbally by saying yes, it is extortion of consent and so is no consent. You can't say that silence on general terms does not constitute consent. If in a sound mind a person remains silent of his or her free will, it is consent. They're not providing these exceptions because they want it to be generally understood that silence generally does not constitute consent. This, dear reader, is dubiousness. They're trying to make investigation impossible.

The second point that a person must be informed is true, but reading these things makes it obvious that our Amnesty International wants to reduce our justice system into arbiters of promiscuous people and activities. All these things are only needed in promiscuous relationships which is contrary to the laws of Nigeria. Sex is not meant to be protected and unprotected. The moment you start mentioning "protected" and "unprotected" sex you're talking about risky sexual activities. God made sex to be between married people which has no element of risk in it.

The third, like the second, reveal that Amnesty International is obsessed about providing arbitration for cases of promiscuity and to help scandalous

and false claims of rape scale through. Saying consent to kiss is not consent to everything else is also a thing that can happen to fornicators. In marriage, the statement "I do" and the kiss that follows indicates the consent to everything declared in the marital vow and everything that follows. And saying consent to kiss is not consent to everything else is like saying consent to swallow is not consent to digest. All such foolishness comes from a wicked and depraved thinking.

The last that consent should be enthusiastic contradicts their previous points that silence does not constitute consent. For if consent must be expressed, then refusal must be expressed too. Their definition of consent just reveals the shambolic, dubious, and depraved mode of reasoning behind this report.

They later said:

"Although no international or regional human rights instruments or standards provide a definition of consent, some guidance on how to infer consent or lack thereof can be found at Rule 70 (Principles of evidence in cases of sexual violence) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Criminal Court (whose mandate covers crimes committed during international armed conflict). It provides that:

(a) Consent cannot be inferred by reason of any words or conduct of a victim where force, threat of force, coercion or taking advantage of a coercive environment undermined the victim's ability to give voluntary and genuine consent;

(b) Consent cannot be inferred by reason of any words or conduct of a victim where the victim is incapable of giving genuine consent;

(c) Consent cannot be inferred by reason of the silence of, or lack of resistance by a victim to the alleged sexual violence;

(d) Credibility, character or predisposition to sexual availability of a victim or witness cannot be inferred by reason of the sexual nature of the prior or subsequent conduct of a victim or witness."

Though they say these can be inferred by the named rule 70, these do not apply in normal cases. Glad they mentioned that this rule, "... covers crimes committed during international armed conflict." So they misapply war time laws to time of peace. In war time it is easy to see why all these rules by the International Criminal Court are very valid, on point and applaudable. In war time there's really no government, no security, no assurance. Nothing. It is literally the rule of guns and bombs. To find a victim in this case not being able to verbally refuse a sexual advancement is understandable. But to say that we can infer what constitutes consent from these in a time of peace,

where there is a constituted government, relative security and assurance, is a very unsound thing to say.

To make this desperate unsuccessful effort to cover up for their inability to give a definition of consent could only stem from not even knowing what consent is in the first place. Telling us what consent is not does not define what consent is. These gaffes can only come from trying to handle a matter that one does not have a proper knowledge of. Common sense tells us that where there is no resistance and an overpowering, it is right to assume that consent was given. In the case of war time, it is best that soldiers and military personnel should keep off from having anything to do with victims of the war. It is wicked to engage in any sexual activity with people in such a state. And it is immoral on account of the fact that they're not legally married to such persons. But it is good for the International Criminal Court to spell out these things so there's no case to hide behind to do this evil.

They said concerning what they call "GENDER STEREOTYPES AND RAPE MYTHS" the following:

"Gender stereotypes and rape myths impede survivors' access to justice. A case manager at Dorothy Njemanze Foundation, an organisation that works to end SGBV through direct support for survivors and attitudinal change, told Amnesty International that they often encounter stereotypes and myths when providing support to survivors. She recalled a case where the police instructed a survivor to withdraw her case, as there was no evidence of rape, because "no pants were torn; no bra was torn." Although the VAPP Act is hinged on a definition based on the lack of consent, this is not reflected in the attitude of the police, as they tend to assess cases based on the idea that rape requires the application of force."

The process used by the Nigerian police is valid, and while I don't know what the VAPP act states I find it really ridiculous to be pursuing a cause using the word "consent" evidently not knowing what the word means. So in trying to even judge the attitude of the police they haven't resolved the core issue of what consent is. When you don't even know the meaning of consent which is key to defining what rape is, is it not folly to be dragging the matter and trying to find fault with the methods of the Nigerian Police?

Seeing I've not read the VAPP act, I strongly doubt that the VAPP act was crafted to concur with the absurdities of Amnesty International. If there's no force and if there's no resistance, it is not rape. How should the Nigerian Police judge a case where all the things that are to serve as evidence are condemned by our "friends" as no evidences? Listening to Amnesty International try to reason must have been very tiring for the Nigerian Police

if they've given any attention to them.

Now let us go to where true meaning is to be found. It is written in the Laws of Moses, "If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; Then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbor's wife: so thou shalt put away evil from among you." (Deuteronomy 22:23 - 24). The refusal of the damsel to call for help makes her complicit to the act. It goes further to say, "But if a man find a betrothed damsel in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her: then the man only that lay with her shall die. But unto the damsel thou shalt do nothing; there is in the damsel no sin worthy of death: for as when a man riseth against his neighbor, and slayeth him, even so is this matter: For he found her in the field, and the betrothed damsel cried, and there was none to save her." (Deuteronomy 22:25 - 27). If it be proven that she did what she could to have been saved, only then is she guiltless. This is how rape ought to be treated. You can't keep quiet and fail to resist and claim not to be complicit to the act.

The act of fornication and rape are the same except that fornication is consensual while rape is not, and fornication must therefore not be treated as rape. To determine what is rape and what is not, these outward signs of whether or not the victim resisted but was overpowered is the only way to differentiate between rape and fornication. To therefore frown at gathering evidences about whether or not the victim resisted before and during the act, or to claim that even silence (on general terms) is not consent, is foolish, dubious, wicked, and is a deliberate action to obfuscate the truth to make the matter confusing and untacklable.

Having made the points that makes it impossible to even investigate whether or not an incident is a rape case or not, they then proceed to accuse the police for asking pertinent and valid questions to help them investigate. They wrote:

"Reports of rape are sometimes disbelieved by the police and other law enforcement agents. They launch an inquisition into the lifestyle and personality of the victim. The survivors often become overwhelmed with the approach to questioning. They are further traumatised by the police with questions like, 'You went to his house? What did you go there to do? Did he take you out? Did he buy you food? What were you doing outside at night? Did you go to the club with him?'"

All these are valid questions, but because they don't have the interest for justice, they call it traumatising questions. If the victim were not ready for

answering questions, why then go report the case? Are they saying that the police should just take the report of the victim without trying to ascertain what exactly transpired and what led to it?

They proceeded to say:

"You will see the survivor right there telling her story and you will see everybody walking in and saying, 'Oh is this the girl that was raped? Is she the one?' So, for me, I feel that the protection is not enough at all. The identity of survivors should be concealed. They should be in a very secure environment so that they are able to express themselves properly. Sometimes, the survivors are put side by side with the perpetrator and you know the perpetrator is looking at the survivor... Then the survivor can't even talk, can't even express herself, because she is afraid."

I agree that people should have privacy but when saying things like the victim can't talk because they're afraid, it makes me doubt further these people really know what they're talking about. If in the presence of the police they see the perpetrators, what are they afraid of that they can't speak? At some point you must face the perpetrator in the course of seeking justice, is it not? And having the accuser and accused come face to face is a long standing way of being able to judge a case rightly. This way you can tell easily if a person is lying, not by just the words of their testimony, but their body language, if a person is stammering, or making contradictory statements of which he or she has to often correct himself or herself.

In the famous hearing of the prostitutes before king Solomon, it was because he had both the accuser and the accused face to face that he could judge the matter rightly. The Romans too were known for the robustness and soundness of their laws, and concerning these Laws, Festus the governor said, "It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have licence to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him." (Acts 25:16). So this is a long standing, effective, and valid way of determining a case. This should be done even while composing a police report on the matter before it gets to court. Frowning at this is another evidence that they're not after justice but are in fact seeking to hinder justice.

While writing this report, I overheard two elderly women speaking and one gave an account of how she was sexually assaulted as a teenager or her early twenties. They weren't talking to me neither did they know I was listening, but it picked my interest seeing it is the matter I was writing of at the moment. She narrated how everything happened and the trauma the mere thought of being raped caused, but I didn't get exactly what prevented

him from committing the act, but all I heard was that he started pleading, but she insisted that she must report the case immediately. In this case it was the victim that was eager to report the case and obviously ready for questioning. It was the perpetrator that was afraid of going to the police. So where is the so called trauma for questioning coming from?

Now I wondered, in such a state of mind it would be easy to determine the truth by having them face to face. If it be delayed, it would give them time enough to craft up stories to cloud evidences.

What I also found rather disturbing, is the fact that they frowned at every solution both to prevent and investigate rape. For example, they wrote:

"Example of wrongful gender stereotyping is failure to effectively investigate, prosecute and sentence sexual violence against women based on the stereotype that women should protect themselves from sexual violence by dressing and behaving modestly."

They went on to say:

"False beliefs people hold about sexual assault that shift the blame from the perpetrator to the survivor (so-called victim blaming). Rape myths include false beliefs that explain and justify rape with the appearance and behaviour of the victim. How someone dresses, how much alcohol they choose to drink, who they choose to go out with, how they behave, how they choose to live their life does not make them responsible for and cannot justify any sexual violence they experience. The victim is not to blame. No one is responsible for how another acts."

Of course investigation should not be halted on these grounds, but it doesn't mean also that people should not dress and behave modestly? The claim that the way someone dresses or behaves cannot provoke rape is total nonsense. If a man has a neighbour that always dress in revealing clothes to come ask for something or return something, or find out something, that form of dressing provokes lust, and lust leads to rape. It is true that there are forms of rape that are not tied to lust, there are some done for some other reasons. But the way people dress and behave is capable of provoking rape and the way someone dresses and behaves can also constitute consent to whatever follows.

Though the way people dress and behave does provoke rape, it doesn't mean it should be justified on that ground. It is just like a person stealing a man's property and seeking to be justified on the grounds that he was showing it off. However, dressing properly and behaving properly is an effective way to

curb rape. As we are having laws and penalties about rape, there also ought to be laws about modest dressing. Immodest dressing prevalent today is a source of concern and conscious effort should be made to correct this.

Now, to the statement that goes, "No one is responsible for how another acts." That reflects the manner of irresponsible and amateurish disposition of mind the authors of this report have. A senior friend of mine posted on his status something that went like, "People keep saying I am not responsible for how others feel, I'm not responsible for how others behave, etc. and that is how we have the crop of irresponsible people we have today." Irresponsible people can never take responsibility for anything because they're not willing to be responsible in the first place. And it is such irresponsible people that could have made such a statement.

They also claim that "False rape reports are rare." They defended this statement by saying:

"There is no evidence to sustain that false reports are common. Rapes are hugely under-reported due to lack of trust in the justice system or because of fear of not being believed. The reality is that it takes a lot of courage and determination to report a rape. And when they do so, women are often blamed and humiliated, being repeatedly asked what they did to provoke it or why they put themselves in a particular situation. Survivors deserve to be believed, their reports should be thoroughly investigated, and they should get the support they are entitled to."

The truth is false report of sexual scandal, of which rape is one, is on the rise in recent years. A casual reader of the news will observe that there is in fact abundant evidence to sustain that false reports are common and so very plausible for each allegation. Ravi Zacharias was accused of countless accounts of sexual misconduct after his death. His son is however proving them false. Brett Kavanaugh was also falsely accused of rape. Donald Trump too was falsely accused of rape. He simply said, "she's not my type" and the case died a natural death because they could say nothing further. Christiano Ronaldo too experienced such false allegations. I recommend the reader to go through the case against Christiano Ronaldo and see how that if these arguments of Amnesty International scale through we'd have false rape cases easily scaling through also. So the statement that it is rare is unfounded.

Of course rape cases should be thoroughly investigated and settling out of court for such grievous acts isn't ideal for the pursuit of justice, but this contradicts all their claims that questioning victims traumatises them. How do you investigate without questioning? You first fight against the possibility of investigation, then you talk about thorough investigation. With what and by

what? This is just like tying someone hand and foot and charging the person, "run! run! Run!" like Delilah did to Samson. Our police are not tied anyways.

They say, "Survivors deserve to be believed" but I dare say no they don't, until after investigations are concluded. Do all the women in the above cases deserve to be believed? Of course not! The findings of a credible investigation deserves to be believed not just the mere testimony of a so called victim.

What I see them saying is that when someone claims to be raped, the police should just accept her claim without asking questions, no investigations, nothing. Just believe them because they say it. Justice too has to be both ways. There must be justice for rape victims as there must be justice for those falsely accused of rape. Sadly of all the rape accusation named above, I didn't see any form of punishment for all the false accusation. After being convicted to have framed up a story against an innocent person the case just dies and they move on with their lives. This is a crime of attempted character assassination. In fact it is a character assassination even if the innocent person is proven innocent. Because people may as well conclude that the innocent person had influence over the judges to have bought his unfair acquittal. Such is injustice. An injustice that ought to be resisted too.

In the case of Nigeria, the crime of rape has death penalty attached to it, so to falsely accuse someone of rape is a grievous crime. It could be seen as both character assassination and actual attempted murder. So there has to be a penalty for that too which ought to be death also because the person sought means to kill an innocent person. This is not to scare people from reporting cases of rape, but to ensure that rape actually occurred and they have their evidences intact.

As important as this other side of justice is, they said nothing about it. Nevertheless this is important to ensure that there is a balance in the pursuit of justice, that one side does not act with impunity against another.

ABSURD STANCE ON SO CALLED MARITAL RAPE

Now, the report also makes a case for marital rape and decries the fact that our laws don't recognise it. It says the following amongst others:

"The Penal and Criminal Codes are also not gender-neutral, do not recognise marital rape... The UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women recommends that: "States should criminalize rape using a definition of rape that covers all persons, includes marital rape and all acts of penetration of a sexual nature, and explicitly includes lack of consent at its centre.""

And they made a recommendation to the National Assembly to "Repeal the provisions of the Criminal and Penal codes that decriminalise marital rape." They allege that our Penal and Criminal Codes are not gender neutral on account of not recognising marital rape, even marital rape has nothing to do gender neutrality or the lack of it.

Now what really is the so called marital rape? It means to have sexual intercourse with a spouse without their consent. Remember these guys don't know what consent means. They don't even know what the statement "I do" when getting married means. They don't even know it means consent.

Indeed in places where they recognise whatever they call marital rape, people do sue their spouses for marital rape. The fact is, everytime there's a case of marital rape, there is also a case of dereliction of marital duties and unfaithfulness. The statement "I do" also entails that one has given his or her word to perform his or her marital duty to his or her spouse. When you sue for marital rape, it is just a declaration that you don't wish to perform the obligations of your vows. It is either we recognise the statement "I do" to mean a promise to perform marital duties and have nothing called marital rape, or we declare the statement "I do" to mean "I don't really do" and recognise marital rape. And when these people express that they expect us to start giving meaning to statements contrary to the meaning of the words that comprises the statement, they should also define the kind of drugs they've given us to take before having such expectations of us.

Apart from the fact that suing for marital rape must have in it a dereliction of marital duties and unfaithfulness, the case of adultery must also be

investigated every time there is such thing as a marital rape. For what else could make a woman cease to desire the husband of her vows if she hasn't turned aside to another man? Yes, there are other possible causes of this, including being married to an abusive man which may (or may not) kill the natural affection a woman has for her husband, but adultery can't be out of the question.

The more sinister nature of this move is apparent in the fact that they don't know what consent means. What this therefore means is that everytime a man performs his marital duty to his wife, he can be accused of rape, of which the penalty of rape is death, because even silence is not consent. The only way not to expose oneself to such risk is to use the method used in the business world to have a proof of consent. This means every man must have a booklet of consent form by his bed. A man would therefore be consulting his wife like a prostitute. It shall not be the natural flow of a loving affection, but a business transaction. And what manner of disgraceful thing is it that love in the beauty of marriage and the activities that flows from it be reduced to a transactional act?



As we have seen, if there is no use of force in a sexual intercourse it can't be called rape, so there can be no marital rape without the use of force on ones spouse. Such force has to be like tying her hands and legs, inviting other

men home to help pin her down, etc. (which things are not heard of) and if such isn't done, it can't be called rape. So why make a move for marital rape if such things don't happen? If the case between a man and a woman reaches this level, it is better to divorce.

Indeed you shouldn't have laws that enables the government to come in between spouses. Not even God our Maker comes between spouses. He, as the institutioner of marriage, holds it so Sacreed that he doesn't come in between spouses. I explained how God does not come between spouses in my book, "THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN HOME". Why then should it be seen as right for a government to come between a husband and his wife? Marriages of course could (and in fact should) have some level of unpleasantness, for it is in this that the strength of love is tested and even fortified, but if the unpleasantness of marriage has been heightened enough to result in marital rape (in the right and true sense of the word), then it is best to first of all dissolve the marriage in divorce, then if there need be, as there probably won't be a need, the government can step in. For a government to have laws that gives them leave to be interfering in the affairs of a standing marriage is not wise, not even if it is at the request of one of the spouses. To do so is to desacralise our marital institutions. If such a spouse want government intervention, let the marriage be dissolved first.

So marital rape is absurd as everything else they've brought up.

HYPOCRISIES

Now let's talk about the hypocrisies of the report and the movement they're seeking to advance. From the presentation of the report all the way to the last word of the report is fraught with dubiousness. We've already seen many evidences of dubiousness. Let us take a closer look at some more.

Starting from the lady who I said presented the report, I did later find some dubiousness in her way of presenting the report. Her manner of delivering her talk was really crafty. She presented her point as though the police raped the girl again. She gave a narration this way, "a girl who is 12 years old told us that when she went to the police station with her father they took her to the back..." After a brief pause, she said, "she was raped." This of course was supposed to mean that she was raped again by the police. Throughout my time at the event all the way to about the time of bringing this book to a close I really thought she really meant that the police did rape the girl again. It was the absence of this from the report that made me rethink what she really meant, and thinking over how she said it again, I realised it didn't necessarily mean that the police did that. She may have just meant that she was pointing out a fact that she had not mentioned earlier that is important to what is being said here. But pointing out that she was raped after saying the police took her to the back definitely suggests that she was raped by the police, for she needn't point out that she was raped at all as all the names she had mentioned before were victims of rape. I'm not sure if that were deliberate, but it certainly did create impression on me that the girl was raped again by the police, and I'm sure it did on others. I was able to understand better only after reading the report which many probably would not. Meaning they'll go with the information and probably spread it. If that were deliberate, as I am confident it really is, then we can be sure that we are dealing with people that are highly trained in the art of dubiousness. In tackling such people we must be really careful lest we get into trouble. Like king David said about the sons of Belial, "But the sons of Belial shall be all of them as thorns thrust away, because they cannot be taken with hands: But the man that shall touch them must be fenced with iron and the staff of a spear..." (2 Samuel 23:6 - 7).

Let's look at their false representation of the rate of rape in the country. As have been said before, their approach to drawing up their statistics for their report is flawed, unverifiable, very likely to be incorrect, and definitely falsified. They claim that rape is endemic in Nigeria, but I don't think they know what endemic means either. Rape in Nigeria is not close to what can be

termed endemic. It does occur, I'm not denying that, but these cases are but exceptions. As said, even one case is one too much. But in seeking to address a matter it must be represented in its right proportion. Blowing things out of proportion, though an immoral practice, may yet be considered effective to create a sense of urgency. But blowing things out of proportion to derogate the culture of people, try to achieve a forced reform, and subvert the will of the people is but to act like counterfeits of the Devil. Yes, I mean to use the phrase, "counterfeits of the Devil" for in counterfeiting there is a pretence to be something other than what one is, but in being a counterfeit of the Devil it means all the pretence has no effect in masking the evil intention behind such counterfeiting. This is an immoral practice to achieve an evil end.

In his speech delivered to the students of THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, on February 15th, 1911, Frank B. Anderson said:

"Let us cultivate our sense of ethical values and of ethical perspective rather than to crouch behind a shrub until it looks like a forest"

It is obvious that the intention of Amnesty International is to make us gather behind the few exceptional cases, blow it out of proportion until it looks like a forest, which is an unethical perspective to present. Their design is that when it looks like a forest they can use those statistics to pursue their true agenda.

The second and supposedly one of the most sinister one is the fact that they're not after finding a solution for rape. They are just throwing punches at our culture, our values, our laws, and even the very solutions to rape. They tactically frowned at every solution to prevent rape or to reduce the likeliness of occurrence. Everything by which you could advice someone about precautions to take in a case where rape is endemic as they claim are frowned at.

They frowned at the need to dress and behave properly when they said,

"How someone dresses, how much alcohol they choose to drink, who they choose to go out with, how they behave, how they choose to live their life does not make them responsible for and cannot justify any sexual violence they experience. The victim is not to blame. No one is responsible for how another acts."

As we have said, rape is not to be justified nor investigations halted on this grounds. But it is evident in this statement that they are frowning at decent dressing and behaviour as a way to preventing rape from occurring. Surely minding those you go out with can also keep you from being raped. For a lady to go out with drunkards, partying late into the night, wearing sexually provoking dresses would most likely lead to rape. But they tactically frowned

at this so when you advise someone to mind those she move with, where she goes, what she wears, etc., it would be taken as a bad advise and the response would be, "I am free to do what I will, I am not responsible for how another acts."

They also support this point in saying:

"What women wear is not to blame: The assumption that what a woman wears can provoke a man to rape her stems from rooted stereotypes about male and female sexuality. However, in reality, women are being raped or assaulted while wearing any type of clothing. No type of clothing is an invitation for sex or implies consent. What a woman was wearing when she was raped is simply not relevant. Rape is never the victim's fault. An understanding that sex without consent is rape is the first step to change social attitudes that further harm rape victims."

It is juvenile to say because women are raped wearing any kind of clothes means that the type of clothing someone wears doesn't matter. They think that they're presenting a valid point saying, "women are being raped or assaulted while wearing any type of clothing." That is to say because women who dress decently can be raped means that what she wears doesn't matter. We also reasoned like that as children. But we've grown up now and think more rationally. As young people you could hear us reasoning somewhat like, "did you hear that Okoro Dele, that very serious boy in class that is always going about with books also failed the exams?" Then the conclusion would be something like, "you know, passing exams has nothing to do with reading or paying attention in class." That is how they're reasoning. Because a woman dressed decently can get raped, therefore what women wear, do, go, behave, etc. doesn't matter. That is really juvenile.

It is a well proven fact that the way you dress, as a lady, determines to a great extent whether or not you'd be sexually assaulted. It is common sense, even though it were possible for women who behave and dress decently to be sexually assaulted. But one thing you ought to know is that most people who sexually assault women are themselves cowards. In my little study on self defence in a book written by a former state security official, he talked about different scenarios in which someone could be attacked, he said people who commit such crimes are usually extremely scared because they know the repercussion of their actions if they get caught. Even a sudden loud noise would startle them and could even make them flee. In cases of sexual assault, it would be extremely hard for anyone to assault you if your dressing suggests that you'd not be a party to any form of immoral activity. The fear of being rebuffed alone would keep people away, not to mention

the fear of facing the law. So, the claim that "what a woman was wearing when she was raped is simply not relevant" is a reflection of a shambolic, juvenile and dubious method of reasoning.

It is also evident that good upbringing is necessary to keep people from being raped, especially minors. But they tactfully frowned at that too when they quoted someone accusing the police saying, "They said that I am too 'loose', that I am not taking care of her and that I didn't train her well." While the blaming a parent at such a time isn't very professional, training a child and taking good care of them will keep him or her from being a victim. Presenting this also is a way of frowning at the importance of good upbringing, parental care and caution, and proper training or that training a child couldn't have been of help.

We could go on and on how they frown at the solutions to rape, but this should suffice. But why are they frowning at all these things? Because their goal is not to end or reduce rape. In fact the more rape cases they have the more empowered they are to achieve their true goals. So rape is their friend. They'd have no success in their foolish crusade if they don't have enough cases of rape. And now though the rape cases we have are but exceptions, they try to blow them out of proportion to have enough arms for their crusade. If right now what they have is but completely inadequate for their purpose so much that they must blow it out of proportion, why and how would they want rape to end? There's no way they'd want it to end. And thus we see the absurd and hypocritical statements they're making on the issue of rape.

To find a solution to rape we mustn't lose faith in the morality of our people, as Frank B. Anderson said again:

"We cannot afford to lose our faith in human nature, we cannot afford to shut out the greater and the best part of life or to gaze so persistently upon the abnormal that we can no longer see the normal and the ordinary."

But how do we find a solution when the case presented by Amnesty International is one that compels us to lose faith in our human nature. To make us believe that rape is endemic, our culture is so immoral to be called "rape culture", a husband is essentially a wife beater, a father is essentially a tyrant, an uncle is essentially a child abuser, etc., what then can we appeal to to make the needed change seeing that there's no conscience to be appealed to? Solutions to acts of such violence isn't like dealing with armed robbery, human trafficking, etc. In armed robbery, properties could be recovered, in human trafficking captives can be set free. But there is no repair to rape. We must work together with parents and other individuals both on

how to protect themselves and also to protect their loved ones if tackling this issue is to prove successful and efficient. How do we then think this can come to mind as a solution if we have been compelled to lose faith in the humanity of our people. For if our culture be rape culture, the people largely are all rapist and they'd not do anything to end the occurrence of rape.

After frowning at everything by which we may find a solution, were the issue of rape really endemic as they claim and not a minor exception, they didn't provide any meaningful solution. They made recommendations to the National Assembly, The Executive, Judiciary, Nigerian Police, etc. To think that a people who don't know the definition of consent is writing to all the arms of our government is quite amusing. Writing recommendations without a proper understanding of the issue you're writing commendations about. All they wrote were remedial and not preventive. All about making laws and enforcing it.

They didn't provide any preventive solutions except randomly mentioning the need to create awareness. But awareness about what? The same kind of awareness that you find in their report that ours is a rape culture. Thus you hear things like:

"Promote changes in the social and cultural patterns of behaviour of people of all genders, with a view to eradicating harmful gender stereotypes and myths around sexual violence through human rights education and campaigns across the country."

You see how that the awareness they're suggesting is just to amplify the absurdities of their report? What ought to be done to such a report? Is it not to tear it up and throw it into the trash can? But no, they suggest we should take it up at a national level and begin to amplify it. What a comedy.

They also make mention about awareness about what the rights of women are. A statement that is rather insulting. Such statements could only stem from a demeaning assumption that we don't know what a woman's right is. Do the people who rape not know they're violating human rights of some kind? If they didn't know why do they try to hide during and after committing the act? If they knew and still went ahead to do it, then what manner of a dumb idea is it that creating more awareness about these things will have any effect to reducing the rate of rape? So that isn't a solution at all. The awareness they're asking for is to change our educational curriculum, change our culture, change our values, etc. and make them conform to values of their own immoral, wicked, debased and shambolic mode of reasoning. It has nothing to do with ending or reducing rape.

If they were going to be proffering a solution I would have thought they'd

make mention of the need to create awareness about how to be security conscious, places to avoid, how to train children to know what parts of their bodies they should never let anyone touch and that they should report anyone who made an attempt to touch them, providing tips for parents on evolving ways from which child molestation could occur, etc. None of these were mentioned. The things they mention are quite useless. Unless they suppose that awareness of their theories like "consent to swallow is not consent to digest" is what we should be promoting.

Rape stems from a failing morality, but could our anti-rape crusaders diagnose the problem to moral decadence and so proffer solutions to help bolster the morality of the society. Nope. That's not their business. The corrupt forms of entertainment doesn't need to be changed and challenged, but our schooling curriculum does. I put on the tv one day and bumped on a play in which a girl was alone when a guy came in, spoke to her briefly and left, and she lamented saying something like, "how could he just come in and leave and not throw me into a world of ecstasy..." This gives the notion that women want to be so used if not raped. In another occasion I heard as someone was watching the tv a woman saying in a desperate tone of voice, "you must have sex with me today." This she said to someone she wasn't married to and after several failed attempt to get him to yield. Such forms of entertainment should have caused an outcry from a people who would like to appear as anti-rape crusaders. The kind of things shown on our tv screens are abominable and contributes greatly to the moral decadence from which rape stems.

We had seen the statement that goes, "In Nigeria, the family name seems to be tied to the vag*na." What they're mocking here are our moral ideals. They're mocking our chaste values that encourages people to protect their virginity at all cost. This is an ideal we all hold in Nigeria. And this ideal does make people cautious and behave in ways that shall not make them prone to rape. But because they're not after ending rape they choose to denigrate our moral values in such a vulgar way. If we don't hold the issue of chastity so sacred there shall be an increase in the rate of rape.

The United Nations themselves, at whose bidding they're probably doing all these ridiculous exploits, don't regard morality one bit. They appoint celebrities who evidently don't have any sense of moral bearing as ambassadors. What else is this than to show a flagrant support for immorality? The Bible says, "As he that bindeth a stone in a sling, so is he that giveth honour to a fool." (Proverbs 26:8). Binding a stone in a sling is an act of queer idiocy and this is what it is like to give honour to people without a good and sound moral bearing. But after showing support for moral decadence, then they send their foot soldiers with the banner of Amnesty

International to our nation wanting to use the issue of a none existing endemic to change our laws, cultures, and values. How disgraceful.

Presenting the idea that seems to say laws and new laws are the solution to mankind's problems is amateurish. I liken that to a man who solves all his problems with a duct tape. If a pipe breaks in the house he solves the problem with a duct tape. If a furniture breaks, he mends it with a duct tape. Even when a baby cries, he shuts its mouth with a duct tape. He solves everything with duct tape because his mind can't think of anything else but duct tape. The same way it is when we think that by laws we can solve all of man's problems. The truth is when there are issues that needs to be handled, the underlying causes must be examined, not merely focusing on penalties for crimes.

Some years ago, the penalty for rape was only some years in prison. Later it was turned to life imprisonment. Then it was death penalty. Do you know that if penalties were enough, even ten years in prison is enough to serve as a deterrent from the act? But after these laws evolve into death penalty we still find that the rate at which it occurs is still the same, though not endemic as Amnesty International claims. There was a case in Benin or so in which someone was raped and then killed. It is very likely that the reason for killing the person was because of the stringent penalty attached to it. Killing the victim may have been the only way to escape the penalty. Was the person brought to justice? Does anyone even have the slightest idea of who it was? It didn't stop the act, it only made it more gruesome. In other cases, stronger laws would only increase the professionalism of criminals. I'm not saying that the penalty of rape should be reduced the slightest bit, but to bring to bare the amateurishness of the thought that laws and new laws is the solution to all of man's problems. Along side making adequate laws, the underlying causes must be addressed of which the chief cause of rape is the failing morals of our society, not the lack of laws.

His Excellency, the Vice President of Nigeria, Prof. Yemi Osinbajo is quoted in the report to have said the following:

"Now, the starting point for conversations around abuse is that it can be prevented and that we can actually do something about it. While we must ensure that abusers are identified and punished, the greater part of our efforts should go into ensuring that we do all in our power to prevent these heinous acts from happening in the first place. How? By proactively identifying risk factors and intervening decisively to deal with them before the abuse itself happens. This is why a comprehensive, multi-sectoral service is fundamental in the response to all survivors of rape and gender-based violence."

How true. Rather than being so focused on remedy after rape, our focus should be more on preventing it in the first place. After this, quoting His Excellency, in talking about what to do in preventing rape, they made a valid statement for the first time. A round of applause for Amnesty International jare! Okay, that's enough. They said,

"The CEDAW Committee has urged States to "adopt and implement effective legislative and other appropriate preventive measures to address the underlying causes of gender-based violence against women, including..."

That is where the validness of their statement ends. They still mentioned "legislative" but let's let that be. For the first time in the whole report they mentioned the need to address the underlying causes of gender based violence against women. Why did they omit this all along? So kudos to them. At least they do see the need to address underlying issues of the problem. Better late than never. But in talking about the underlying causes they then returned to their absurdities. They said the underlying causes includes:

"... patriarchal attitudes and stereotypes, inequality in the family and the neglect or denial of women's civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, as well as to promote women's empowerment, agency and voice."

Nothing is mentioned about morals again. Of cause they're the champions of immorality and the strife to maintain immorality is seen even in this report. When they say inequality in the family, what exactly are they talking about? Let me ask, does inequality in the family lead to violence? If a man is the bread winner of his home, does that mean he's going to be beating his wife?

The claim that women are neglected and denied their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights in the Nigerian constitution is a farce. The Nigerian woman is as free as any man. The constitution guarantees that.

They went on to say:

"Such prevention measures should include awareness-raising activities regarding women's human rights, gender equality and the right of women to be free from violence; use of educational curricula to modify discriminatory social and cultural patterns of behaviour, and sensitisation of the media regarding violence against women. Additionally, CEDAW requires states to "develop and implement effective measures to make public spaces safe for and accessible to all women and girls, including by promoting and supporting community-based measures adopted with the participation of women's

groups."

Which culture, for crying out loud, says that a woman does not have the right to be free from violence to warrant the statement, "awareness-raising activities regarding... The right of women to be free from violence"? Don't we cherish our women and hold them in honour? At least before these foolish feminist movement took root and spoilt the character and manners of the younger ones. And even at that we cherish and honour our women still, holding them in high esteem, far more concerned about their wellbeing than for that of their male counterparts of any age. And in such a state, what need do we have of "awareness-raising activities regarding... The right of women to be free from violence"?

The effect of this can be seen already. On radio stations every now and then you'd hear, "stop the violence against women." These people should consider the gravity of their statements. They are witnessing against themselves. It's like when an innocent person is arrested and they force him to testify against himself. To be echoing "stop the violence against women" is to witness against ourselves that indeed ours is a "rape culture." So they should desist from that for two reasons. The first being that the witness that ours is a rape culture is both false, unfounded and insulting. Second is that it also gives credence to a false claim and give the globalist foot soldiers a lot of room to operate. So people and organisations should stop echoing what does not make sense and what is unwise to echo.

SUNDRY ISSUES

Before bringing the book to a close, let me touch on few other absurd things worth mentioning on this matter.

Laws And More Laws

First, let me revisit the issue of trying to cure all societal problems by laws and more laws. Not that I write in direct response of anything written in the report, but I wish to caution us to be wary of the type of reasoning behind this report. We must be careful not to allow ourselves to fall into the trap of trying to beat our societies into shape by endless laws. I know having laws that touch on everything would seem like being thoroughly committed to the good of the nation, but that is not necessarily the case. Laws are not for reformation but for the protection of individual rights, freedom and the general good of all. So here I'd like to speak against the mode of thinking that the more the laws the better.

One of the major absurdities worth repeating here is the fact that they present laws and new laws as the solution to all of man's problems. They said:

*"Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition)
Act should be implemented."*

Why do we need a prohibition laws against each category of people. Must our society be segmented into bits and pieces before the rights of people can be protected? We need a separate law fighting discrimination against women, a separate on for girls, children, people with disability, boys, pregnant women, working class people, business people and all. Everyone need their own discrimination (prohibition) law. If we are to segment people like this, where then would the so called equity come from? If one law that applies to this does not apply to that?

In a case where you want that there should be no discrimination against disabilities, is it new laws you'd look to? We already have enough laws that ensures that none is discriminated against and these covers people with disabilities. In this particular case, to enforce this law in question almost all the architectural structures in the country would need to be modified if not pulled down and rebuilt. Many aspects of our development have already been done to be suitable for people with disabilities. People can only be

encouraged to endeavour to consider the needs of those with disabilities in the ways in which they raise their structures. And where people have the funds and are disposed to do so they will. Where they don't have the funds and are not disposed to do so at the moment, to force them with a prohibition law to do so would amount to tyranny even though this tyranny wears the smiling face of a good will.

It was Jean-Jacques Rousseau who said, "man is born free, yet everywhere is he in bonds." One of the ways in which people are denied their liberties is by the tyranny that comes in the smiling face of good laws. If there is anything that men should cherish and protect the most, it is their freedoms and liberties. But ill-meaning people are ever scheming new ways to suppress and tyrannise over their fellow men.

We shouldn't try to have a societal ideal that is law-intensive. Segmenting people into bits and pieces to make specific laws for each individual isn't wise. To seek to form a habit in the citizenry by laws and new laws is unnecessary and a wrong application of laws. Education, awareness and proper journalism are the means by which good habits and ideals are formed, not laws.

We need recommendations from people who know the right use of laws, not from Amnesty International which doesn't seem to know that the more laws a country or institution has the more silly and infantile it looks. We need recommendations from people who know what constitutes the civil liberties of people, not from Amnesty International which seems to be of the disposition that people ought to be caved in by laws, even against their justifiable will.

When there are laws in place, what is more important to do is to ensure that the laws are enforced. Some time ago I saw that there was a movement demanding that the penalty for corruption should be death. I'm no friend to corruption or corrupt people, but does it have to be death? We already have laws against corruption that are not being enforced, why are they not bothered about that? Any politician with the will power can do a great deal to curb corruption with the present laws. We've seen cases where merely sacking one erring public official caused others to sit up. So is it death penalty that is going to be enforced when other lesser things are not enforced? Enforcement of present laws is more important to an infinitesimal degree than making new laws.

I keep hearing foreign agencies giving speeches about making new laws in our dear nation, but laws ought to originate from citizens, not foreigners. I heard about an foreign official of one foreign body talking about creating some kind of legal architecture or the other. I didn't bother reading it or

trying to get what he's saying but I found that to be really repulsive. Why are foreigners making such a beeline for our laws? They should be ashamed. It is a show of lack of manners to be actively engaged in such activities in another man's country. When the people and their leaders see the need, let them make laws and new laws. If the present laws can't secure your prospective investment, then find somewhere else where they have laws that are suitable for your own kind of investments. All these actions are like stepping into someone's house and telling them how to arrange their furniture without them calling for your input.

The Achievement Of Being Raped

Another absurd thing is the seeming attempt to glorify being raped. They coined a word to describe rape victims, not wanting to call them victims, they call them "survivors". Yeah! What is remaining is to call rape victims "champion of champions".

Not withstanding all the sentiments being raised in defence of rape victims, being raped remains a disgraceful thing. And that is where the sinisterness of the crime lies. Let's push sentiments aside, and let's be clear, rape remains a disgraceful thing. Justice must be sought of course at all cost, but the campaign to glorify rape won't help solve the problem one bit. Tamar, understanding the reality of things, unlike our friends here who want glorify being raped, said to her half brother at the moment he was about to rape her, "... Nay, my brother, do not force me; for no such thing ought to be done in Israel: do not thou this folly. And I, whither shall I cause my shame to go?..." (2 Samuel 13:12 - 13). It was going to be rape of course, a real case of rape where there is actually resistance and the use of force, unlike the manner of "rape" presented to us by Amnesty International, but still she knew well that to be so used was a shameful thing, describing it as "my shame". So let people know that it is shameful to be raped. Calling people survivors will embolden them to come out and say "I too am a survivor" even if they actually consented to the act by which they lost their virginity. They'll call themselves survivors to cover their shame. It's like bragging about some achievements. I plead with ladies, rape remains a shameful and disgraceful thing to experience, never make yourself prone to such a use.

Unquantifiable Trauma

Now, the word trauma was used a lot in the report to defend certain things

including why police ought not to question victims about their experience in the process of investigation. At one point, as we have seen earlier, it is written:

"They [rape victims] are further traumatised by the police with questions like, 'You went to his house? What did you go there to do? Did he take you out? Did he buy you food? What were you doing outside at night? Did you go to the club with him?'"

How are these traumatising? From the way they present their points, what it seems like they're advising the police to do is just admit a rape victim and just take their testimony for a report. They're advised not to ask any questions. Is this the way to seek for justice or are they merely seeking to create a system where alleged victims have sweeping powers to declare suspects as guilty at will? Of course the police has to know if or not the victim was raped or if the act was consensual. They also have to know, if it were rape, was the victim complicit in their own rape and to what extent were they complicit. How can these be found out without asking these pertinent questions? But they say to ask such questions is traumatising, so don't ask them.

Now the issues of mere feelings are not things that can be quantified or verified and when someone says she is traumatised you just have to take it that she is. And just like the case of presenting the statements of witnesses anonymously for their safety's sake can be abused to pour out unfounded lies, this idea of giving heed to mere feelings can be abused as it could as well be faked and could be used to impede the process of justice.

Someone told a story of how he met this really fat girl going for jogging. He went over to say hello not taking cognisance that it was a bit dark and the place was secluded. After a brief conversation, they parted but from that time on he stopped seeing her go for exercise for two full months. After two months he saw the lady again. Asking why she hasn't been going for her exercise she said she was traumatised because he greeted her when it was a bit dark and a bit secluded and it took her two months to get over the trauma. From what I perceived, the person presenting this said these things in an attempt to try to make us try to understand the female sex, how such a little thing could traumatise them. But here I saw a lazy fat girl using trauma as an excuse not to go for exercise. The same way people could use the pretext of experiencing trauma to excuse the need to keep their mouth shut when they know the truth of the matter and their complicitness in their own "rape" could be found out if questioned.

When people, refusing to heed their parents' injunctions and other godly advice end up in such mess, they'd need such laws as is presented by

Amnesty International to protect them from the consequences of their bad actions and even get rewarded for it, thus promoting promiscuity. When they go heedlessly into perversion, they could easily claim to be raped to brush off the shame of their lack of character, morals, and reason. Rather than have the shame that such poor character deserves, they'd instead win to themselves the glorious title of "legendary champion of champions". Sorry, I meant to say "survivors". All for what? They got raped. Then they'll then be taken to a free shelter where they'll get free ice cream and sharwama, free DSTV subscription, hot bath, and so on. All these at the government's expense. All for what? They got raped. We've not even taken care of teachers, which I think is the most noble profession, and other worthy people of society the way they deserve, it is for people who neither know how to behave nor guide their life safely, or for people whose parents don't know their duties that we should be catering for as kings. Even if this is coming from the United Nations, it is not just right.

Swimming Through Blood

In my article titled "THE SIXTEEN DAYS OF ACTIVISM - MY REVIEW", I raised a concern that some women may just be pursuing the issue of gender justice to bolster their own political and career advancement and gave my reasons why I suspected that this could be the case. I quoted John Ryder Haggard who said in his book, "Allan Quartermain":

"See thou, Macumazahn, a woman will swim through blood to her desire, and think nought of it."

I lamented the fact that using the cases of actual rape and gender based violence victims to try to bolster one's career and political ambition is one and the same as heaping the bodies of these women who are prostrate by circumstances to enable one climb to her own desires. This is just like swimming through blood to get to one's desires. This is evil.

It is obvious that Amnesty International isn't interested in reducing or ending rape. They too are just using the cases of these people prostrate in the mire by circumstances to get what they want, which among others include abortion, pulling down the patriarchal family structure, recognition of marital rape, forced societal reforms, and a general subversion of the will of the Nigerian people. This is disgraceful. This is swimming through blood to one's desires.

A lady who was herself a victim, as she said, and who is also engaged in similar movements against violence against women told me quite plainly that

many of these NGOs are merely pursuing their own interests, not the interest of rape victims. Being a rape victim herself she must have valid reasons to say so. Their use of the so called testimonies of victims to have to proffer “solutions” that are only injurious and by no means able to reduce the rate of rape, makes it obvious that they can’t possibly be interested in helping victims.

Gender Based Violence Are Usually Avertible

Gender based violence are usually avertible. When you look into homes where gender based violence happens you’d see that the process of wedding the couple is somewhat idiotic and contrary to cultural norms. A friend of mine told me of what he saw in the university, how a male student maltreated and threw out the girl with whom he was cohabiting for putting too much spice in the food she had prepared. He saw this girl and felt pity. He called one of his female friends to take the girl with her and take care of her. But in the morning this girl went back to the boys house.

This is idiotic because the parents of the two people sent them to the university to study, but look at the foolish and immoral life they’re living while at school instead of focusing on their studies and keeping themselves till they’re ripe for marriage. If these two later get married, there’d be endless case of violence.

Others don’t make proper considerations before getting married. They don’t consult the experienced for advice, neither do they read good books. Some don’t even consult their books of faith, which things are necessary for making right choices. Rather they’d go reading all these crappy romance novels where you’d see on the cover a super muscular guy grabbing one slender delicate blonde by the waist. By the foolishness they see in these things they make choices. How shall they not end in a total disaster?

I once saw one delicate sweet looking girl dating one guy that looks exactly like Machete. He goes about shirtless, wearing nothing but a vest on his upper body. He has his great mustach and goes about in a bike like Harley Davidson. I really don’t know how the friendship came about but I believe it must have been motivated by the stupidity in romance novels and movies. Of course the relationship went sour. Some get married for money and ignore everything about character, some marry for a range of other wrong reasons. All these things are the causes of abuses and violence, not our

culture. Our culture itself has measures that can help secure a blissful marriage which many people like to ignore, thinking that as "modern" people they ought not to give heed to these things.

I had a chat with the lady who said she was a "survivor" herself. She told me that her very own sister is married to a beast. She said she doesn't call that kind of person a human being. She narrated all manner of terrible things he does to her. She said this to mean that it is better to be divorced than to live in an abusive marriage. Well, the issue of whether divorce were the best solution for gender based violence or not is another day's topic. But I asked her if someone wanted to get married and came to her for advice about how to respond to a young man that had just approached her for marriage. She made a lot of salient points which I agreed to completely. Then I asked her if she thinks that her sister considered these things when getting married, she said she strongly doubts. And as for me, I'm convinced they did not. People just see one guy and consent to marry him because he keeps disturbing them or for some other crappy reasons without making proper considerations.

It is possible that even after all the proper considerations humanly possible people still find themselves in abusive marriages, but it will be far more scarce than what we have. I was born and raised in a circle where thorough care is given in the issues of marriage and you very seldom hear of these kind of sorry stories from our marriages. It is near zero.

Now in cases where people go reading romantic novels and making silly marital decisions, why should that now be a national problem where people are even calling for state of emergency? And the government in an act of good gesture consents to declare a state of emergency. It is better to declare a state of emergency on all these things that cause people to get married without proper considerations than to be declaring state of emergency when people start reaping the reward of bad choices. The consent of two individuals to get married isn't a national problem, so whatever results from it shouldn't be a national one either. Their family and extended family should see to it.

The same goes for rape. Usually rape cases are avoidable. Rape isn't something that takes place as easily as let's say picking pockets. It must be done in extremely isolated space. I speak of actual rape, not the one that someone will go as far as kissing someone but then say with Amnesty International, "consent to kiss is not consent to whatever follows..." I speak of actual rape. It can be avoided. For grown ups, proper caution can reduce the cases of rape to near zero, and for minors proper caution by parents can reduce it to near zero.

CONCLUSION

Now let's draw a conclusion on the matter. Let's start with a little story.

A Little Story

There was a man who was arrested and jailed for bank robbery but there were no proofs against him. The governor had approved his sentence being convinced that he was guilty of the crime despite not having a concrete evidence. The partners of this criminal organised and funded a protest against the decision of the governor. The protest grew more and more each day. The governor came under immense pressure and because there were no concrete evidence apart from minor hints linking the criminal to the act, he didn't have much to defend his decision. So he had to let the criminal go free.

While in jail the criminal had boasted to the jailer that he won't be in jail for more than two months. The jailer took him to be bluffing, but he didn't spend up to three weeks in jail before he was released.

As required by the law he was given an handsome amount of money which was meant to enable repentant criminals settle down for a honest life. So he was entitled to that for spending only three weeks in jail. When he left the jail he blew all that money away living a lavish lifestyle because he knew he had so much in store from their previous bank robbery. He was above the law and lived like a big boy.

Not long after he left the jail there were two hugely successful bank robbery without any trace of who could be responsible. The police however inspected the mode of operation of the criminals and inspected the way they had opened the vaults and realised that the two operations were done in an identical way, but no hint of who was responsible could be gotten. This left the police and the governor further perplexed.

One day, the criminal went shopping and bumped into this really beautiful young woman coming out of the mall he was going into. He spied a flush on her cheek as she eyed him and he too was taken by her beauty. They had a brief conversation from which he learnt that she was the daughter of an old banker. They exchanged contacts and kept up an ongoing conversation. The relationship advanced at jet speed and within a short time he was already

like a member of the young woman's family. He wrote to his partners in crime telling them that he has found the lady of his dreams with whom he'd like to spend the rest of his life. He vowed never to engage anymore in bank robbery or lay his hands on another man's money. He was turning a new leaf, planning to move far away where his past acts can't be brought up, and settle down with this beautiful young lady. His partners were sad but he was resolved on his decision.

One day while he was in his fiancée's house her father brought home a money vault and boasted to his family members that they have just got a new vault of which it was impossible for any to break through. Observing it, the former criminal thought the old man was mistaken. However, his decision to quit bank robbery was enough breakthrough for the banking sector. So he ignored it and joined in the happy moment for it was a mark of a huge success for his bank. They had a mini feast after which while observing the vault a little child was mistakenly locked in it. No one could open the vault and it was like she was going to get suffocated and die. The house was in a great panic as they could hear faint cries of the little girl. There was no solution at hand. Someone suggested using an explosive device, but that would claim the girl's life. The thought of the girl dying was overwhelming and her mother began to cry.

You know when a woman is in love she begins to see her lover as a superman who can do all things. After pacing here and there in the pandemonium, she came up to him and grabbing his clothes and with tears in her eyes said, "isn't there something you can do?" Being eager to help he asked her to give him the pin in her ribbon and with some other devices around he got to work. And within five minutes the vault was opened. The little girl ran out with tears in her eyes and embraced her mother. There was a sense of relief everywhere.

He expected to have his fiancée come thank him but she had suddenly disappeared. There were two men standing by the vault all the while he worked on opening it and carefully watching him as he worked. When he was through they came and observed the vault carefully. Took some notes, and getting up, presenting their ID cards, they told the former criminal, "nice work, your prison van is waiting for you downstairs." It was then he realised that these were police men dressed in casual outfit and this whole drama was staged to get evidences against him and to get him arrested. And off to jail he went.

The Devil Behind The Movement

Sorry to have bored you with that long story. It is a retold version of a story titled "A RETRIEVED REFORMATION" in the book, "ROADS OF DESTINY". Now just like in the case of the criminal, we can easily know who's responsible for something when we observe and notice the method that is being used. And when we assess the method of Amnesty International and similar bodies we can see the signatures of the Devil. He has used their method over and over again. And when we observe his past works they all have things in common.

In the fall of man he used the same method. He met the woman and told her that she could be equal, not with man, but with God. Here, in the case of Amnesty International, we see the approach of moving the woman to be discontent with her state. He deceived her to believe that she could be greater and better off than where God placed her. And the result was the fall of man.

In recent years the struggle to be equal with man has birthed all manner of abomination including abortion, same sex marriage, and other godless laws. For in many so called developed countries the rise of feministic movements saw the rapid rise of such abominable laws.

After several successes we now have them coming here, and moving to other nations of the world, trying to move women to a state of discontentment, creating all manner of false realities, and without even taking long, they're already pushing for their abominable laws. They're pushing against anti-abortion laws, patriarchy and advancing the feminist agenda of seeking equality with man. Of course she can't dare seek equality with God anymore. The consequent pangs of child birth would not make her risk it again. But she will keep seeking equality with man.

The progress of feminist movements in Nigeria so far has resulted in parents having less time to look after their own children. To encourage the woman pursue ambitions that would make her seem equal to a man, while children are abandoned and the door flung open for the Devil to prey on them. Is it no wonder that we are hearing endless bad news coming from boarding schools where parents dump their children not wanting to see them again. All these to allow the woman time to pursue vain ambitions.

So the pattern is the same. Amnesty International is seeking, in the words of Frank B. Anderson, to make us gather behind shrubs until they appear as a forest so that they can move the woman to a state of discontentment to the headship of man. We can easily see then that Amnesty International is merely pursuing the Devil's bidding.

The Disadvantage Of The Movement

There are many obvious disadvantages both to the woman and to others. But women should know that they're equal losers in this agenda.

Feminism destroys the peace and wellbeing of the home. As said before, it makes children vulnerable to the Devil and abuse. God's institutions for raising children up is the home. The filial affection of parents is necessary for the protection of their young. Speaking from a first hand experience, I'm not yet a father but I have nieces and nephews, and I can say that the way I feel about my blood is quite different from the way I feel about any other child. This is because of the filial connection. When we dump children with people without this connection we put them at great risk. We've seen videos of how house helps maltreat children. We've heard news pouring out of boarding schools because children are put in a prolonged care of people without that filial affection for them. So the hazard of trying to make women equal with men is having its toll on our children.

I wrote a lot about feminism and its adverse effects in my book titled, "**THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN HOME**" and I won't wish to go further talking about it here. So I recommend that book. Like this, it is absolutely free.

This same movement, especially the evil being done by Amnesty International that seeks to create a false reality, isn't good for the mental health of women. When they present rape and violence against women as a rule, and not an exception, what sense of worth or importance can women derive from this? In this way women would see themselves as mere objects of rape and abuse, rather than seeing themselves to be objects of love, affection and care. Seeing themselves as a natural victim would have its toll on the mental health of women. Amnesty International is quick to talk about the trauma of rape, of violence, of even questions of which one ought to be eager to answer in their quest for justice, etc., but what about the trauma of seeing oneself as a natural victim rather than a natural object of love and care?

In case you're wondering if or not there is no such trauma or damage to the mental health of women, I have seen it manifesting already. I was at a group discussion once where the issue of gender based violence, rape, etc., had been a heated matter at one point in time, not long after all that a lady in this discussion brought up a question and asked, "why do people give birth?" And her point was directed at why do parents have to give birth to children when the world is such a terrible place. You could tell from such a question,

because it was not presented as philosophical one, that such a lady was probably wondering why she should have been in such a world where all these things alleged by Amnesty International and their likes happen. Where humans of her gender are a natural victim. It was an intelligent question actually and I had spoken about this in my book **"THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN HOME"** which was published several years before that occasion, but it was presented from another point of view. The thought came to my mind a long long time ago when I perceive how parents treated their young ones like refuse. I also expressed this thought in my novel, **"DE-ZOMBIELISERS"** where the bad guys were children of parents who didn't like to have the responsibility of raising their own children. These things made me wonder, "why do people give birth?" But back to the discussion we had. Believe me, all the people who responded against the notion of people giving birth were women, whereas the men were so comfortable with the idea of giving birth and describing the psychological needs of giving birth, the blessedness of giving birth, etc. But the young women didn't speak so much in favour of that. Surely they're not happy as they're being deceived by Amnesty International and the media that they're a natural victim.

Questioning why one exists reflects a terrible state of mind. It is a painful experience to have the essence of living shrouded by circumstances big enough to make one wonder why he or she should exist. It is worse when we observe that this pain is brought about, not by the right view of life, but by a distorted view of it. And this distortion is brought about by the orchestration of ill-meaning people.

Viktor Frankl in his book, "Man's Search For Meaning" writes of how extremely important it is for a person to have a sense of meaning in life. He narrates how having a sense of meaning and something to look forward to helped him to scale through the bitterest times of concentration camp and the loss of the sense of meaning proved even fatal to others in the concentration camps. He also explains that the loss of the sense of meaning was also the cause of many cases of suicide.

He quoted Friedrich Nietzsche who wrote, "he who has a why to live for can bear with almost any how." In response Viktor wrote, "wœ to him who saw no more sense in his life, no aim, no purpose, and therefore no point carrying on."

True, women are not in concentration camps that the only way to survive is by maintaining a sense of meaning in life, but Viktor explains that circumstances don't really matter. The ultimate need of man and the prerequisite for having the will to carry on must be hinged on having a sense of meaning not on circumstances. Relating it with concentration camps was

just to prove how effective it is to have a sense of meaning in life. The major desire of humankind is to love and to be loved, to own and to be owned, and this desire is stronger in women. Even the women who in their error think it is a mark of strength not to love or desire to be loved do unwittingly show the desire to love, to be loved, cared for and even pampered. To paint a bleak picture of how women are natural victims to battered and raped has a major damaging effect on a woman's sense of meaning.

So, let's be clear, this whole false reality forwarded by Amnesty International and the media which they and their likes have influence over, is doing a major harm to women. After almost every radio segment, you'd hear "stop the violence against women" and these don't even think what manner of effect this so called awareness about mere exceptions would have on women, especially younger ones. The ones who are already married to a loving spouse and have friends who are themselves married loving spouses probably can tell that contrary to all the noise about ending the violence against women, these are but exceptions. But the younger ones would not be able to see this so easily. When they present rape and violence as a rule and not an exception, the world becomes dreary to womankind. So I advice all these activist to desist from their unwise and desperate acts and let life be what it is. A happy place where the best friend a man can have is a woman and the best friend a woman can have is a man. All these in the persons of their spouses.

The Enemies Within

Amnesty International is not the only organisation recruiting foot soldiers for foreign bodies trying to bring down our dear nation. There are many out there. They all with a smiling face of good actively advance evils in this land.

A friend of mine who works in the public health sector told me about some of the activities of foreign agencies. How they buy and supply drugs to prostitutes for free. I'm not talking about cheap agbo they offer to prostitutes in kettles, I'm talking about really expensive drugs. And they don't just provide them for prostitutes to come get them, they hire people who serve as foot soldiers going after prostitutes in the field to give them these drugs.

That's a whole lot of money being poured into keeping prostitution alive and vibrant in the country. I know you'd hear explanations that it is to prevent the spread of HIV, but it is not. This is terrible to behold for immorality can consume a whole nation. I thought on the matter and wondered, if people really cared about our dear nation at all. All these money could be poured

into education for crying out loud. How many schools do we have that don't have adequate lab equipments for hands on training? Yet providing such equipments is not one of their interests. Their interest is to bolster the prostitution industry. This is evil.

Others come from other far away countries to come educate us on breast feeding. And I wonder, how can a group of people cross the ocean and what they could come educate us about is breast feeding. Don't we breast feed already? Don't we have even far better ways of raising our young than they? But when they come they start taking pictures of the bare breasts of breastfeeding women and using them on banners, fliers, magazines, and other marketing materials, distributing them to schools, public places, and broadcasting them all over the Internet. Why? Because they're trying to promote breast feeding. Let me be clear that these are just preambles to an evil agenda designed to corrode our moral systems. They don't care about the health of our young one bit.

I spoke to someone who claims that she can breast feed her young anywhere. She presented her point as an act of care for her young saying, "I can't deny my baby food." She also says that the reason for bringing her breast out is to breast feed her baby so it's no ones business. I told her that that is one and the same as pooping in public and saying you're undressing because you want to poop, so it's no ones business. We can see the level of hypocrisy by which foreigners and some locals seek to corrode and bring down our moral system. With the face of care for our young they're trying to promote nudism. In no distant time they'll say if breast feeding mothers can breast feed in public, there's no reason why people can't go around naked. In some countries they're already passing such laws and in some other countries they're already movements pushing for such abominable laws.

In my article titled, **"THE VERY FUNNY ALLEGORY ABOUT THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH"** I shared the following story:

"One day, a man borrowed a fry pan to fry something, let's say chips. He hurriedly used it, washed it, and returned it to the owner immediately without any delay. When he returned it he put a very little insignificant looking dish in the fry pan. The owner of the fry pan asked "what is this for?" His response was "The dish? O, as I was using your fry pan it gave birth so I thought I should return it with its child." Seeing it as an expression of appreciation, the owner said "O, thanks a lot." Saying this he took both the fry pan and the dish.

"After a while the borrower came again and borrowed the fry pan. This time he didn't return it early, in fact he didn't return it at all. When the owner was anticipating the return of his fry

pan, he waited for five full months and as the fry pan was not returned, he lost his patience. He went to the borrower and angrily demanded for his fry pan but the borrower said "what fry pan?" "The one you borrowed from me the other day, have you forgotten?" retorted the owner. "O, that fry pan! I had forgotten. You see, as I was using the fry pan, it died."

"This little looking issue resulted in a very big quarrel that was so hard to settle though the whole village where it happened got involved. Why? The owner accepted the profit of the stupid fable and now it was time to bear the loss of it he became angry and started to appeal to reason that such a thing couldn't have occurred. If he knew this, then why did he accept the dish? Though he was right in his stance against the stupid fable, his acceptance of the insignificant looking dish made it a bit tricky to settle the dispute."

The moment you accept one thing they present to you with the face of care for the health and wellbeing of our young, they will bring a host of other things that will make it hard to refuse on the grounds that we have accepted the first. For the same reason, A.W. Tozer warned in one of his sermons that we should never let the Devil stick his nose into our tents. He said if we let him stick his nose into our tents very soon we'd have to let him bring in his whole body. This speaks perfectly about our case for it is their noses they're also poking into our national affairs. The acts of these foreign bodies which try to influence our values, culture, etc. is a clear act of poke nosing. Let's push their filthy noses away. Let them mind their own business.

Advice To The Nigerian Woman

Now I advise the Nigerian woman to not allow themselves to be a tool against the nation. They don't care about you. Take a closer look at their antics and you'd see that they're merely seeking to use you against the nation. In a sense of patriotism as well as devotion to God refuse to give heed to all their foolish persuasions.

The false realities they're presenting isn't true. The best friend a man can have is his wife. And the best friend you can have is your husband. Don't let these foot soldiers of the Devil bring about enmity between you and your best friend. I admonish the Nigerian woman to be committed to building a healthy home in all wisdom and godliness. Remember the Bible says, "Every wise woman buildeth her house: but the foolish plucketh it down with her hands." (Proverbs 14:1). Build your own house therefore on the wisdom of God's principles rather than the folly of Amnesty International. Don't pluck it down.

Who would you rather have teach you? God in his infinite wisdom or people who don't know how to define what consent is? Of course the answer is simple. Love God, love your husbands, love your children and be grateful to God for them.

To the single Nigerian lady, I admonish you to be chaste and look forward to a happy home. Don't be afraid of the so called gender based violence presented as a rule. Even if it were a rule. Be committed to right doings, building in yourself the character and habit needed to build a healthy home when the time comes. And by God's grace you'd not marry a monster. You'd marry a human being.

And I think there should be a word to the Nigerian man too. Yes there is a word for the Nigerian man too, but let wise king Solomon speak instead, "Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of [the Nigerian] man." (Ecclesiastes 12:13).

Summary

The report of Amnesty International has the following qualities:

1. It indicts the whole nation of Nigeria, her people, and laws.
2. It derogates her culture in vulgar terms and denigrates our values and accepted ways of life.
3. It seeks to make a case for the legalising of abortion.
4. It fights against patriarchy upon which our family structure is founded.
5. It has a poor and unverifiable investigative process.
6. It takes an absurd stance of rape.
7. It makes a case for the recognition of marital rape and defends it with profuse absurdities.
8. It is insincere in its presentation, putting forward the face of fighting against a non-existing rape culture but actually pursuing a sinister cultural change.
9. It is advancing a cause that is damaging to the family system and even to women themselves.

Closing Remarks

I bring this book to a close and recommend it to the attention of every Nigerian. The essence of writing this is to expose the sinister and dubious nature of the agenda of Amnesty International for the purpose that necessary actions can be taken in relevant quarters. I'm a novice in many things and can't state what actions can be taken against such unacceptable, derogatory, denigrating, dangerous, and dubious report against Nigeria, her laws and her people.

This is the time to arise and resist the sinister agenda of Amnesty International and their sister agencies. We don't need to wait until they have successfully turned our society upside down and destroyed our values. We don't have to wait until it becomes a desperate case where we'd start praying for a Donald Trump to come reverse all the stupid laws they're trying to introduce into the country. They may never allow that happen if they're allowed to gain grounds and make advancement in this their sinister agenda.

Think of the future of your children and grand children. Think of how against your will they'll be forced to learn about things that shall be injurious to their moral upbringing and bearing in the very schools where they ought to acquire right values and build their character. Think of living in a world that legalises same sex marriage and other abominable practices. Think of all these things and know that if that ugly future is going to be averted, the time to act is now.

We should learn from the case of America where such laws have been established even against the will of the Americans, not even with a conservative as president could they reverse it easily. Seeking to reverse all these Devilish laws, Trump, despite being the president, was battered left and right by the media and other liberals in what has been rightly called by him "a presidential harassment." America is really lucky to have been able to have the crop of conservatives they have now who are able to come to the rescue and are able to stage such a good fight against the Devilish laws that have crept into their system. We may not be so lucky. The establishment of these wicked laws may as well spell the end of our dear nation. So the time to act is now.

Where required, I look forward to feedbacks from you, the reader, which can be sent to me via my email, info@ayomikun.com.ng.

I pray that God shall grant us all the wisdom and strength to play our part in preserving the sanity, moral wellbeing, good and right values of our dear country. God bless Nigeria and preserve her from her enemies, now and always. Amen.

Thank you and God bless you.